DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 456 CS 508 731

AUTHOR Hochheimer, John L.; Hochheimer, Joanne Dvorak
TITLE Starting Anew: Exploring the Links between Radio and Journalism Education in Post-Revolutionary Romania.
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (77th, Atlanta, GA, August 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Journalism Education; *Mass Media Role; *Program Development; *Radio; *Revolution; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS Historical Background; *Romania

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the evolution of Romanian radio, as well as some of the inherent problems of journalism education in Romania in the post-revolutionary era. The paper discusses the legacy of repression during the Ceausescu dictatorship, which limited radio services throughout the country and left only one journalism school, a school that primarily focused on learning political propagandizing. The paper then discusses the role of radio in the 1989 revolution, and notes that building a new broadcasting system after the revolution has proved difficult. The paper next discusses existing and new broadcast journalism programs after the revolution, noting that these programs lack qualified teachers who can facilitate student growth. The paper concludes with a discussion of the possibilities for democratic media development in Romania and what Western journalism education colleagues can contribute to the development of democratic systems in Eastern Europe. Contains 42 references and 24 notes. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 456

Starting Anew: Exploring the Links Between Radio and Journalism Education in Post-Revolutionary Romania

by

John L. Hochheimer*
Roy H. Park School of Communications
Ithaca College
Ithaca, NY 14850

and

Joanne Dvorak Hochheimer**
Department of Communication
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Hochheimer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Paper presented to the International Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual conference, Atlanta, Georgia, August, 1994

AS 505 731

---

*J. William Fulbright Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Philology, History, and Physical Education at the Universitatea din Timisoara, Romania, in 1993.

**Site Coordinator for Holt International Children's Services For Children of Romania in Timisoara, and a consultant to the Journalism Faculty at the Universitatea din Timisoara, in 1993.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The legacy of repression during the Ceausescu dictatorship in Romania has limited radio services throughout the country, as well as it has left a lack of trained journalism faculty. This paper examines the evolution of Romanian radio, as well as some of the inherent problems of journalism education in the post-revolutionary era. The paper then offers some examples of how faculty at the University of Timisoara began constructing their new journalism curriculum.

"My reading of the signals of the present times seems to indicate that a participative society is at present gradually being built in our world--partly by the powers of historical forces on which we exert no control and partly by the efforts of men and women who struggle for a more just and happy society in which to live. Building a participative society requires our contributions both at the microparticipative *and the* macroparticipative *levels. At the micro level we need to create environments favorable to participation in families, factories, schools, churches and neighborhoods. At the macro level we need to find out what social structure, what institutions, and what legislation is amenable for facilitating participation in national life"* (Diaz Bordenave, 1994, p. 47).

"I may have my opinion about many things,
about the way
to organize the struggle; the way to organize the
Party;
an opinion, for example, that I formed in
Europe, in Asia,
or in some other country of Africa, from
reading books
or documents, from meetings which influenced
me. I cannot,
however, pretend to organize a Party or a
struggle on
the basis of my own idas. I have to do this
starting
from the reality of the country."
(Amilcar Cabral, quoted in Freire, 1983).

The ostensible revolution of 1989 has been the major turning point in contemporary Romanian life. Yet, while the assassinations of Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife, Elena, in December, 1989, removed the heads of

the dictatorship from control, the more firmly rooted controls of internal oppression remained. Forty-plus years of virulent governmental repression, near starvation of the population, regular shortages of the necessities of life, as well as excessive layers of mistrust and fear, combined with a crumbling infrastructure in which one must struggle every day for the merest levels of existence, have left a legacy of apparent paralysis throughout society.[1]

Since the eastern European revolutions of the 1980s, there have been widespread efforts at implementing western-style forms of civil society in the various countries throughout the region, which mirrored development efforts throughout the Third World in the 1960s and 1970s. As parts of these more recent efforts in the field of mass communications, has come an influx of advisors, consultants and faculty members to the former Soviet bloc who have been attempting to assist the governments in the creation of western-style media infrastructures. Journalism structures and practices have received particular attention as a means of supplementing the

---

[1]The goal of the Romanian government was much the same as Havel (1991) described of the regime in pre-revolutionary Czechoslovakia: "Here power had unintentionally revealed its own proper intention: to make life entirely the same, to surgically remove from it everything that was even slightly different, everything that was highly individual, everything that stood out, that was independent and unclassifiable" (p. 129).

transition to an American-style democratic form of governance characterized by "the potential for freedom, equality, justice, security, risk-sharing, material well-being, and self esteem" (Binder, 1986, p. 7).

While many Romanians recognize the necessity to have such changes in their country, they seem unable, or unwilling, to initiate changes in their personal circumstances. In order to understand radio, as well as the status of broadcast journalism education, in contemporary Romania, it is vital to recognize that the personal internal repressors, manifested as the inability to choose purposeful actions without external sanction, have left members of this society ill-equipped to work for their own common better futures.[2] This can best be demonstrated by describing Romanian radio prior to, and since, the 1989 revolution, as well as recent attempts to initiate university journalism education programs (which are intended to lay the foundation for the future journalists).

---

[2]As Andriy Demydenko, Ukranian deputy environment minister, said of people in both Ukraine and Russia, "We have a totalitarian legacy of citizens not making decisions--since long before the 1917 socialist revolution, someone always made them for us. To teach people to use information democratically, we have to educate a new generation. It doesn't happen overnight" (quoted in Weisman, 1994, pp. 47-48). This legacy is no less true for people in contemporary Romania and in other former eastern bloc countries.

Pre-revolutionary Radio

Although at one time there were five regional radio stations (in the cities of Cluj, Craiova, Iasi, Timisoara and Tirgu Mures), the locus of most Romanian radio production was in Bucharest, the capitol. News people were licensed by the state, so that there could be a constant check on who they were and what their affiliations might be. University students could volunteer to work at stations to gain experience, but they were required to pass a state-sponsored examination in order to gain full-time employment. As part of their pre-employment screening, Communist party membership was required, and family background checks were routine.

After graduating from the University, one could go to the Communist Academy in Bucharest, in which the country's only journalism school was located. This part of a student's education primarily focused on learning political propagandizing for three years, before allowing him or her to do regular broadcasting. In this way, journalism education was seen as an official function of the state propaganda mission.[3]

---

[3]In a 1977 decree, President Ceausescu announced his conceptualization of the role of the news media in Romanian society: "The press is an instrument of the party and has to disseminate the party's policies in all of its spheres of activity...In the press field...we have to take a range of measures against whatever liberalist spirit which allows the possibilities for conceptions which do not serve socialist and communist education" (cited in Gross, 1990, p. 97).

All radio programming was pre-recorded so that government censors could regularly review everything prior to broadcast. Not only news programs were censored, but everything that could be aired was subject to overt governmental control. For example, the station weather forecaster might call the local weather service. But, if rain were forecast, the censor would not allow it to go out on the air, because if this were announced, peasants might not go into the fields. Announcers would be instructed to say that, "there are a few dark clouds passing briefly over the city, but they will pass soon" and people should report for work. Similarly, censors would not allow the announcement of low temperatures below a certain level, because workers were allowed to stay home if it were to get too cold. Without official announcement of the temperature on the radio, there would be no official verification of its level (Herzog, 1993).

In 1979, Ceausescu ended official censorship, and instead imposed an "unofficial" self-censorship (titled "self-responsibility") system. Everything was pre-recorded even further in advance of broadcast, so that editors could listen to excise anything deemed "wrong." Thus, a news program could be done a week ahead of its broadcast time, because it had to be pre-recorded and screened. Still, if a person were to say the wrong thing,

he or she would be fired. The result of this new system was more, not less censorship than in the past (See Gross, 1990, p. 98).[4]

Radio was seen as another aspect of government-directed consciousness control, a subset of what all other media and government functions were doing. An unsigned article in the Romanian journalists' professional journal, *Prese Noastra* (published in 1988), revealed the extent of the subservient role of the press to the government and to the personality cult of Ceausescu:

> "Journalists, all press workers make the core of their activities the study and firm understanding of the exceptionally significant work of comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, of his profoundly scientific concepts of creating the new system with the people and for the people based on objective assessments, and the concrete-historical condition of our country, and not on borrowed models" (cited in Gross, 1990, p. 96).

Nevertheless, despite all of the development of this centralized system of hegemony, by 1985 Elena Ceausescu decided the decision-making and information sources were too diverse, and that

---

[4]The missing components in this system were the listeners themselves. There was no linkage by the radio station to the audience, no thought given to the needs of their listeners, only to those of the state. No one in the government or at the radio stations much cared who listened or when. Sometimes, Radio Bucharest took some informal polls about its listenership, but no one at the stations paid them much heed (Herzog, 1993).

control needed to be more stringently repressive.[5] On January 20, she decreed that all regional radio service was to stop at noon, and that most broadcast equipment was to be shipped back to Bucharest. Workers were fired, and all control ceded back to the capitol. This is the system that was in place until the end of 1989.

Radio and the 1989 Revolution

Radio Bucharest had retained two studios in Timisoara, as well as a skeletal staff of 3 reporters and a technical team to do remote reports from that city. When the revolution of 1989 began in Timisoara on December 22,[6] it was possible for local radio technicians to get to work right away. Within two hours of the outbreak of the revolt, 50 people showed up at the station to help. National radio in Bucharest did not

---

[5]As Lord Acton noted, "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Romania under the Ceausescus had become a prime exemplar of this aphorism. Subsequent to 1977, as they tightened their grip on power, the formal and informal systems of repression developed into a pattern: "as life deteriorated more and more, as the guidelines imposed by the leadership became more and more absurd, isolated protests could be heard to contrast with the general submission, and private initiatives were taken, but there was no solidarity, no trust among people, no underground network, no organized and known dissidence, no alternative. The Securitate (secret police) became more and more involved in everyday life. It was resented as an invincible and incurable epidemic" (Harsanyi and Harsanyi, 1993, pp. 245-246).

[6]As graffiti, plaques, and street names throughout the city remind all who pass today.

know what to do, nor did it have the ability to shut down a transmitter more than 500 kilometers away from the capitol.

Later, at 8 p.m. on the night of the 22nd, national radio joined the coverage of the events in Timisoara. The station, now called "Timisoara Libera" (Free Timisoara), began broadcasting around the clock, inviting local residents to speak their minds on the air. And come they did, throughout the day and night, with all kinds of messages of support, food, hospital supplies; hundreds of people surrounded the station for protection (despite the fact they were unarmed) from an attack by the army or Securitate personnel, which many people feared would come to suppress the revolt. People slept in the station day and night to protect both the equipment, as well as their communication channel to the outside world.[7]

Their spirits may have been willing, but people's creative juices at the time must have been weak (Herzog, 1993). In the heady days of the

---

[7]While this can be seen as a prime manifestation of the spirit of freedom in the vox populi, the tone and content of their messages saying "How glad I am that the revolution has come," according to the head of the station (Herzog, 1993), sounded to many ears much like the older shows of the support for the old regime (when people routinely made statements such as "How glad I am that this is a national holiday").

revolution, people feared its failure.[8] Who knew if, or how, the revolution might be successful? What might be the consequences for failure? When, and in what ways might the state security forces wreak revenge for what had happened in the streets?[9]

Radio Since the Revolution

Building a new system has proven to be difficult. About one-half of the people trained in the old controlled system have come back to work at the stations. Staff members are unfamiliar with the basic elements of democracy, nor have they had training in the conventions and *weltanschauung* of working in a free news media environment. There are now six state-sponsored regional stations in Cluj, Constanta, Craiova, Iasi, Timisoara, and Tirgu-Mores, as well as a national radio program

---

[8]That this revolt occurred at all, despite the years of repression and its subsequent fatalism among the people, demands further analysis. It had been commonly accepted that the anomie of the populace was widespread. Romanians had "...established a way of thinking and behavior expressed in such fatalistic responses to any attempt at protest as: it won't change anything at all, one could disappear and the sacrifice would be in vain for it will not make any difference and will not lead to anything but trouble, it would actually worsen the already bad situation, no one will show any support, etc....This attitude was reinforced by bringing up the fatalistic nature of the Romanians, which was taken for granted and was not supposed to be challenged" (Harsanyi and Harsanyi, 1993, p. 249).

[9]As Harsanyi and Harsanyi (1993) point out, Romanians are reluctant to commit themselves politically, since they are caught "between an unattractive past and an uncertain future" (p. 257).

emanating from Bucharest,[10] making it difficult to breed a new sense of professionalism and journalistic ethics.

Romanian news editors have tried to copy broadcast styles of other nation's broadcast operations, such as the BBC, VOA, Deutsche Welle, etc. They have sent their reporters to Germany, Holland, and the United Kingdom, primarily, for training in technical skills of radio production. The primary charge they have given their reporters is to "tell the truth;" yet, the question of "whose truth?" provides fodder for frequent debate. Many reporters want to engage in news analysis; few demonstrate the ability to do factual reporting about what is happening. The stations try to have some staff members trained in the west, and they provide classes to analyze program content and to discuss techniques of good news reporting, production, and presentation. A cursory listen to the stations, however, reveals that, to date, their skill levels remain quite low, and much training remains to be done.

---

[10]There is also a growing number of private commercial radio stations. Their formats copy closely other commercial stations throughout Europe. However, the licenses to operate are slowly being allowed by the national government so as to minimize the possibilities for news coverage which might be critical of government policies. Even today, the state of the national economy provides, at best, a weak advertiser base for these stations and they command, as yet, only a limited audience. Therefore, their roles to date have been minimal. If the economy expands, they may become an increasingly vital factor in Romanian mass communications.

Current programming at Radio Timisoara, for example, consists of a mixture of music and discussion programs for a widely diverse audience (in terms of ethnic origin). People are free to say what they want. Programs are conducted in seven languages, reflecting the fact that the city is in the corner of Romania where Hungary, Serbia, Croatia, Bulgaria, eastern Austria, Ukraine, and Slovakia are nearby. There are weekly listener call-in programs to discuss issues with members of local government, the regional ministry, the mayor and local prefecture. The chief of the Timisoara station says that his listeners trust the stations because they think the station's reporters are "sincere."[11]

Broadcast Journalism Education in Post-revolutionary Romania

While so many changes have been taking place in post-revolutionary Romanian radio, the process of change at the universities, where the education of future broadcast journalists is expected to take

---

[11]An indicator of listener support came in the summer of 1991. The government ministry in Bucharest overseeing broadcasting tried to change Radio Timisoara's frequency in order to reduce station broadcast power. Many hundreds of letters and petitions came in response, as well as public expressions of support for the station by the police and the army. Union leaders and their members, among others, threatened to strike on behalf of the station. There were marches through town, and people brought food to the station, fearing a re-enactment of the fear at the time of the revolution. Ultimately, the government backed down and the frequency was not changed (Herzog interview, 1993).

place, has been decidedly slower. An examination of the pedagogical philosophy of faculty members, which is currently in a great state of flux and challenge, reveals much about the authoritarian tradition of Romanian academia.[12] Even though the faculty-elected administrators at the University of Timisoara are visionary democrats who support progressive change, trust relationships are a new Romanian experience (as Harsanyi and Harsanyi, 1993, point out) and will take time to evolve among individual faculty members.[13]

There are, to date, two publically-funded university journalism programs (in Bucharest and in Timisoara), with two new programs (in Cluj

---

[12]One can easily imagine the difficulty of a Romanian economics professor, who had been analyzing, and teaching, Marxist-Leninist theory for many years, now becoming an advocate of the liberal economic analyses of, say, Adam Smith, John Maynard Keynes or Milton Friedman. Similarly, journalism faculty who had been trained in state-mandated propaganda and who use "banking" methods of teaching (See Freire, 1970), have been finding it difficult to explain and model what, to them, are more contentious and adversarial relations between students and teachers, much less between reporters and government officials. It is far less problematic to hold onto older established power relations than it is to embrace the new, the untried, the threatening.

[13]A media system can never be more democratic than the political system within which it is imbedded (Jakubowicz, 1990, 1993; Vreg, 1990). Further, one cannot easily teach people to develop a democratic media system when they have never been allowed to see democratic behaviors modeled (Hochheimer, 1992).

and Iasi) still in formation. Each is dedicated to the education of journalists, primarily in print. The Timisoara program is intended to be both a print and a radio/television journalism program, while it also is intended to train instructors of English (which, the faculty members and university administration say, is another major need in contemporary Romanian society).

It is a comprehensive, four-year program which seeks to prepare students for the world of newswork in a changing society. Its goal is to ground students of journalism in the theory, history, analysis, economics, ethics, policy and practice of society in post-revolutionary Romania in the 1990's and beyond. It seeks to prepare young men and women who are intellectually engaged with the major issues of their times, who are able to articulate clearly the primary issues which face Romanians in the process of working in their country, society, and economy, and who are committed to the processes of the democratization of communications in civil society.

Yet, the program is predicated on the belief that their students must also recognize that their training is coming at a time when their society is also undergoing major changes. The needs of Romanians, as observed by westerners, for good, objective, factual information in helping them to understand the major issues of the day have never been greater. As all of

eastern Europe has been struggling with the legacy of post-1989 changes, so, too, have the news media been grappling with how best to serve their audiences. The faculty seeks to provide its students with the tools necessary for reaching out to their audiences in times of great change, to help them understand, and to provide them with the information they need to act in the best interests of their country, of civil society, and of themselves as they move into the 21st century.

All journalism education programs and press systems throughout eastern Europe are having to contend with the major problems both of rebuilding or merely establishing the training of journalists (European Journalism Training Association, 1992, p. 1), while their societies are in flux. Romania is certainly no exception. Models of journalism education dedicated to training journalists working in a free press system which come from outside Romania (principally from the United States) can only provide broad suggestions about what is needed in a Romanian program, since many of these ideas may be ill-suited to the realities of the Romanian experience.[14] And, there is a lack of qualified teachers trained

---

[14]American models of free press systems often display little understanding of the social, political, or economic concerns of news workers or readers, much less the historical ramifications of capitalism upon communication theory (Hardt, 1993). Moreover, the widespread introduction of journalistic practice based upon these models into eastern

in the ways in which a free press system operates who can train the next generations of eastern European faculty. This, university administrators say, is their primary need (East-West European Journalism Educators Conference, 1993).

Thus, the new program in Timisoara was developed by the faculty to meet the issues they see of being of greatest need in Romania. It is grounded in four key areas:

1. The development of reporting and writing skills is emphasized in many of the journalism courses required of all journalism majors.

2. The education of thoughtful analysts and consumers of the media is emphasized in the Analytical Media Studies component of the program.

3. A dynamic new journalism program will be more international in focus. Students will, over the course of their studies, master English. They will need this skill, both as active participants in civil society, and as potential teachers, or professional users, of English.

Europe since 1989 mirrors the active diffusion into the developing world of many programs based upon western models of development in the 1950s-1970s, which, we must note, had many disastrous results (Ascroft & Agunga, 1994; Beltran, 1980; Rogers, 1976; R. White, 1994; S. A. White, 1994). We fear the same fate for the work of well-intentioned journalism educators from the west who are "parachuting in the experts" to diffuse press models and practices into cultures and among people who may not be equipped, or who may have no desire, to imitate them.

4. The only way to learn journalism is to do journalism. Courses will, to the extent possible, be practice-based. Theory will then emanate from student interaction with the world (Hochheimer & Dvorak Hochheimer, 1993b).

Crises in Broadcast Journalism Education

While all of these ideas sound good on paper, they mask some very real problems for the development of journalism education in Romania. The primary issue is the lack of qualified teachers who can facilitate student growth. Up until 1989, the only school of journalism in the country was at the Communist party graduate academy in Bucharest, where students were given three years of ideological indoctrination and propaganda studies. The current program in Bucharest is an outgrowth of this academy. Since most journalists and journalism teachers were also trained here, there is a lack of practitioners, as well as faculty members, who know how to conceptualize information gathering and reporting along democratic principles.

Further, there is a lack of people qualified to teach either basic skills and conventions of broadcast journalism or, more critically, skills and

conventions of life in a democracy. There is no tradition of contentious fact-finding in Romanian media.[15]

And, who is there to teach new skills? The faculty members by and large were educated in the old, didactic system and they replicate the faculty-student relationship exactly as it was under the Ceausescu regime. This begs the question, of course, about how students are supposed to learn about democratic behaviors, including the toleration of a multiplicity of opinions, when neither students nor faculty have ever seen such

---

[15]Finding simple "facts" is a treacherous business. People in totalitarian regimes found that, in order to survive, they had to live in a dual reality. They had to live an official, public reality in which they were expected to mouth the official pronouncements of the state under fear of punishment or reprisal. They also lived a private, clandestine reality, in which they recognized the pervasiveness of government mendacity, yet they were fearful, with little hope for change, and distrustful of finding solidarity with others (Havel, 1989). The experience in Romania is quite the same (Harsanyi and Harsanyi, 1993). Given this, how does one determine what a "fact" is? Whom do you trust?

And, given their experiences with state-supported media, many members of the public are none to eager to place their trust in Romanian news reporters. Whereas media under the communist regime were seen as servants to the power structure of the party, broadcast media are now seen in terms of their obeisance either to the national government (for national media, i.e., the two national television stations as well as Radio Bucharest), to advertisers (in the case of the small, yet burgeoning, private radio stations), or to constant critiques of the government among local stations. Finding simple reliable information, devoid of opinions, is, to say the least, problematic on many levels.

behaviors modeled for them in the classroom (Hochheimer, 1992). Yet, beneath this lies a more fundamental problem: many Romanians are afraid to make choices and, once made, to act upon them. Decision-making or creative problem solving was never learned; indeed, independent thinking and action was punished. The legacy of Ceausescu is that, although he is dead as a physical being, he is alive in the psyches and the hearts of many of his countrymen and women. They can see a problem, even articulate that something needs to be done about that problem, but they seem almost paralyzed to act to do something about it.[16]

At the University of Timisoara, for example, the journalism faculty can say with conviction that they want to create a journalism program, but they are unable to connect thinking about what they want with acting to accomplish that goal. They were unable to articulate what kind of journalism curriculum they wanted. They wanted change, but they feared any changes. To act requires one to assume responsibility, and yet their fears about possible reprisal were too great for them to act. Almost any

---

[16]Some Romanian colleagues say that they still fear that they may be incarcerated, or worse, for daring to establish a western-style journalism education program at the University. This fear certainly explains a part of their reluctance to engage in too much change too quickly. Given recent examples of government repression of opposition news media in neighboring Hungary (Perlez, 1994), these fears are hardly ill-founded.

suggestion about initiating a new program, or making a change in old ones was met with, "No, this is just not possible in Romania." It was only through extensive meetings with faculty members, and the utilization of social work facilitation skills, that our colleagues were able to transcend their fears (Dvorak Hochheimer and Hochheimer, 1994).[17] The faculty can provide plenty of reasons why something is not possible, but they are unable to propose strategies for dealing with the problems that exist (Hochheimer and Dvorak Hochheimer, 1993a).

While such fatalism is indicative of a peasant society (Verba, 1965; Rogers, 1969) which Romania no doubt remains (Gross, 1990), it is clear that such a pessimistic approach is also true of an educated faculty, even one that espouses a desire to modernize the country's news media delivery system. Indeed, the journalism faculty members have well learned the lesson of the oppressed: to think with their mouths, but not with their minds; to accept the world in terms set by others, rather than

---

[17]It is, ironically, the administration of the university (which is elected by the faculty), much more than the faculty themselves, which supports the creation of democratic media education and practice in Timisoara. Indeed, both the Rector and the Vice-Rector seek to make Timisoara a center for democratic communication in eastern Europe (Todoran interview, 1993). "In Romania right now," says Vice-Rector Stefan Balint, "everything is possible," if only the faculty had the confidence to act (Interviews, 1993).

interacting with the world on their own (Hochheimer, 1992). The reluctance of these Romanian intellectuals to initiate progressive actions (as described by Harsanyi and Harsanyi, 1993) is still very much in evidence.

Possibilities for Democratic Media Development

Which leaves western colleagues with some large issues to consider in attempting to answer the question about whether radio, and broadcast journalism education, can contribute to the development of democratic systems in the east. Given the responses of listeners in Timisoara to the threats that their local radio station might be curtailed or shut down, it appears clear that the local people consider "their" station to be a vital link in the processes of their freedom. The people who were willing to lay their bodies on the line to protect the station at the time of the revolution know how important was the station to the sustenance of cultural renewal. Innately, they understand the importance of free communication to themselves and to their neighbors. And the way they communicated that knowledge was to come to protect their major conduit of information, i.e., the radio station. When the station was threatened a second time in 1991, the community again responded to protect what they saw as the public interest and necessity.

Yet, despite these experiences in Timisoara, there is not, as yet, a link between that committed level of political, social, and cultural dialogue and action (shared through the radio station), on the one hand, and the faculty which purports to teach the next generation of journalists about what is possible in a system of democratic media, on the other. A primary issue not yet integrated into their understanding is that the radio station, and the University itself, do not stand apart from the community within which they are imbedded (Hochheimer & Dvorak Hochheimer, 1994). As long as journalism education teaches students that the proper role of the journalist is to stand outside of the world in order to comment upon it, the democratic possibilities which inhere to those media will be lost (Hochheimer, 1992).

If, however, the nascent journalism faculty continued to receive regular support through integrated input, reflection, and support from those who have had experiences in building and operating media in participatory contexts, then the foundations for new, more democratic media in Romania may flourish. The twin refrains, "In Romania, nothing is possible" and "In Romania, everything is possible" both have their roots in the experiences, the expectations, the hopes, the confidence, the fears, and the visions of those who are working for that country's future. To nurture

the optimistic actors, we must encourage their own experimentation and share with them our experience, not to tell them how they must act, or how to imitate the experiences of the west. Rather we must work with them, on a regular basis, to help them facilitate *their* conscientization (Freire, 1973, pp. 41-58) and practices of what forms of communications might be possible in a newer, more democratic future, all within a cultural milieu which they believe fits *for them* (Ascroft and Masilela, 1994; Martín-Barbero, 1993; Nair and White, 1994; Roach, 1993).

Eastern European journalism faculty and administrators desire a regular sharing of experiences, both between east and west, and between east and east. They desire journalism faculty and media professionals from western countries to come east, on a continuing basis, to share their experiences. Our Romanian colleagues expressed a desire for as much exposure as possible to a range of experiences, both successes and failures, which pitfalls to avoid, and how they have been confronted in the past, in order to imagine what they might possibly accomplish.[18] They demonstrated a need for exposure to problem-solving skills in imagining

---

[18]The second East-West European Journalism Educators Conference, held in Timisoara in April, 1993, made the same recommendation for new journalism programs throughout eastern Europe.

what to do,[19] in the processes needed to carry their ideas into action,[20] in the actions themselves,[21] and in the experience of taking responsibility for the outcomes of their decisions.[22] Sustained encouragement will enable that process to take the time necessary to evolve.

---

[19] The university has a $44,000 radio and television production facility which was donated by the International Media Fund. However, there is no technical staff, so the faculty doesn't allow the students to use the equipment except under cosely monitored circumstances for fear that if they use it there might be some damage which they could not fix.

[20] Another possibility was to establish a series of collaborative relationships with community radio and TV stations so students could get experience with their equipment. When this was proposed, it was supported by both the university administartion and the various station managements. Yet, faculty members feared initiating a dialogue to these ends until we had many lengthy discussions about this.

[21] A typical student journalism exercise is to do person-on-the-street interviews about some current event or issue. Yet, when we attempted to do this with our Romanian students, our colleagues said this would be impossible for them to do since, "what if someone came by and saw that I had no students in my classroom? I would be severly punished for this." When posed with this problem, they felt unable to act, or to ask: Who does a faculty member approach for permission? How is the request phrased? These are skills which they wanted to learn, yet they felt unable to initiate them.

[22] There were no faculty meetings due to fact that the professors needed to hold down three jobs in order to make enough money to take care of their families. So, there was little time for sharing ideas or trouble-shooting problems. Also, faculty members believed they could not challenge their own professors (who had previously taught them in older ways of working) with new ideas, since this might be considered disrespectful.

Eastern colleagues also expressed a desire to come west, on a continuing basis, to see the range of ways in which democratic media, including radio, can operate. They want to see both the most democratic forms,[23] as well as the more traditional commercial forms of broadcast and print journalism with their inherent lack of democratic practices.[24] They desire the exchange of ideas in a forum where they do not fear for their futures (East-West European Journalism Educators Conference,1993). They requested, also, to experience the ways in which democratic learning, and shared problem-solving, are best implemented.

In these ways, radio (and broadcast journalism education) can best realize its potential for being a contributor to the development of democratic media in contemporary and, hopefully, in a more democratic Romania (as well as throughout eastern Europe). As Diaz Bordenave (1994) points out, participative communications are a part of the building of a participative society. To this extent, their future is necessarily bound to our own.

---

[23] With all of their inherent problems. See Hochheimer, 1993.

[24] They are already all too familiar with the least democratic forms of communications media, i.e., as propaganda arms of the state.

Do we help facilitate their needs as they experience them, or do we merely remain spectators and dictate what we see from our own experiences in the west? Can radio and journalism education be a sedative or a contributor to the development of democratic systems? Just like our colleagues in the east, the answer must lie not just in our discussions, but primarily in our actions, both at the micro, as well as the macro, participative levels.

REFERENCES

Ascroft, Joseph & Robert Agunga (1994). "Diffusion Theory and Participatory Decision Making." In White, et al., **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development**, pp. 295-313.

Ascroft, Joseph & Sipho Masilela (1994). "Participatory Decision Making in Third World Development." In White, et al., **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development**, pp. 259-294.

Balint, Stefan, Vice-Rector, University of Timisoara (1993). Interviews, February-June.

Beltran, Luis Romero (1980). "Farewell to Aristotle: Horizontal Communication." *Communication*, 5: 5-41.

Binder, L. (1986). "The Natural History of Development Theory." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 28(1): 3-33.

Diaz Bordenave, Juan (1994). "Participative Communication as a Part of Building the Participative Society." In White, et al., **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development**, pp. 35-49.

Dvorak Hochheimer, Joanne & John L. Hochheimer (1994) ""Necessary Preconditions to Facilitating Media Access." Paper to be presented to the EURICOM Colloquium on Media Access, Piran, Slovenia, September.

East-West European Journalism Educators Conference (1993). Press release, April 1.

European Journalism Training Association (1992). "Journalism Training in Central and Eastern Europe." Report of the conference, Maastricht, Holland, 19-22 November.

Freire, Paulo (1983). **Pedagogy in Process: The Letters to Guinea-Bissau**. New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo (1973). "Educaton and Conscientização." In **Education for Critical Consciousness**. New York: Seabury Press, pp. 41-58.

Freire, Paulo (1970). **Pedagogy of the Oppressed**. New York: Seabury Press.

Gross, Peter (1990). "The Soviet Communist Press Theory--Romanian Style." In Splichal, et al., **Democratization and the Media: An East-West Dialogue**, pp. 94-106.

Hardt, Hanno (1993). "Alternative Visions of Democracy: Theories of Culture and Communication in the United States." In Splichal & Wasko, **Communication and Democracy**, pp. 87-102.

Harsanyi, Doina & Nicolae Harsanyi (1993). "Romania: Democracy and the Intellectuals." *East European Quarterly*, XXVII(2), 243-270.

Havel, Václav (1991). **Disturbing the Peace.** New York: Vintage Books.

Havel, Václav (1989). "The Power of the Powerless." In **Living in Truth.** Boston: Faber and Faber, pp. 36-122.

Herzog, Bogdan, Director, Radio Timisoara (1993). Interview, 26 April, Timisoara, Romania.

Hochheimer, John L. (1993) "Organizing Democratic Radio: Issues in Praxis." *Media, Culture & Society*, 15 (3): 473-486.

Hochheimer, John L. (1992). "Toward Liberatory Pedagogy for Journalism Students: Adapting Paulo Freire's Praxis to the Non-Poor." *College Literature*, 19(1): 12-27.

Hochheimer, John L. & Joanne Dvorak Hochheimer. (1994) "All The News That's Fit: Introducing Journalism Education As If Students' Lives Mattered." *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 18(2): 118-129.

Hochheimer, John L. & Joanne Dvorak Hochheimer (1993a). "Ein Erfahrungsbericht aus Temesvar, Rumanien: Probleme und Chancen einer demokratischen Medienreform." (Timisoara, Romania: Problems and Possibilities for Democratic Media Reform). *LfR Funkfenster*, 2 (Mai): 21-22.

Hochheimer, John L. & Joanne Dvorak Hochheimer (1993b). "Statement of Purpose: Journalism Program, Universitatea din Timisoara." Faculty of Philology, History, and Physical Education, University of Timisoara, Romania.

Jakubowicz, Karol (1993). "Stuck in a Groove: Why the 1960s Approach to Communication Democratization Will No Longer Do." In Splichal & Wasko, **Communication and Democracy**, pp. 33-54.

Jakubowicz, Karol (1990). "Between Communism and Post-Communism: How Many Varieties of Glasnost?" In Splichal, et al., **Democratization and the Media: An East-West Dialogue**, pp. 40-55.

Martín-Barbero, Jesús (1993). "Modernity, Nationalism, and Communication in Latin America." In Nordenstreng & Schiller, **Beyond National Sovereignty: International Communication in the 1990s**, pp. 132-147.

Nair, K. Sadanandan & Shirley A. White (1994). "Participatory Development Communication as Cultural Renewal." In White, et al., **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development,** pp. 138-193.

Nordenstreng, Kaarle & Herbert I. Schiller, eds. (1993). **Beyond National Sovereignty: International Communication in the 1990s.** Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Perlez, Jane (1994) "Thousands in Hungary Denounce Dismissal of Broadcast Journalists." *The New York Times*, March 16, p. A2.

Pye, Lucian & Sidney Verba, eds. (1965). **Political Culture and Political Development.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Roach, Colleen (1993). "Reflections on Communication and the Cultural Rights of Peoples." In Splichal & Wasko, **Communication and Democracy**, pp. 169-185.

Rogers, Everett M. (1976). "Communication and Development: The Passing of the Dominant Paradigm." *Communication Research*, 3(2): 121-133.

Rogers, Everett M. (1969). **Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication.** New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Splichal, Slavko, John Hochheimer, & Karol Jakubowicz, eds. (1990). **Democratization and the Media: An East-West Dialogue.** Trieste: Faculty of Sociology, Political Science Journalism, University of Ljubljana.

Splichal, Slavko & Janet Wasko, eds. (1993). **Communication and Democracy.** Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Todoran, Stefan, Rector, University of Timisoara (1993). Interview, 5 February.

Verba, Sidney (1965). "Conclusion." In Pye & Verba, **Political Culture and Political Development.**

Vreg, France (1990). "Dilemmas of Democratic Pluralism in Social Systems." In Splichal, et al., **Democratization and the Media: An East-West Dialogue**, pp. 10-19.

Weisman, Alan (1994). "Journey Through a Doomed Land: Exploring Chernobyl's still deadly ruins." *Harper's*, 289(1731, August): pp. 45-53.

White, Robert (1994). "Participatory Development Communication as a Social-Cultural Process." In White, et al., **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development,** pp. 95-116.

White, Shirley A. (1994). "The Concept of Participation: Transforming Rhetoric to Reality." In White, et al., **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development**, pp. 15-32.

White, Shirley A., K. Sadanandan Nair & Joseph Ascroft, eds. (1994). **Participatory Communication: Working for change and development**. New Delhi: Sage Publications.